

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Okada et al. (US 6,181,870).

Claims 1-5 are objected because of minor informalities.

The Title of the Invention is objected for not being descriptive.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1-5 in accordance with the Examiner's comment, and has added new claims 6 and 7. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are presently pending. In addition, Applicant has amended the Title of Invention in accordance with the Examiner's comment.

Objection of Specification

The Title of the Invention is objected to as not being descriptive. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the Title to read "RECORDING MEDIUM REPRODUCING APPARATUS WITH MULTIPLE REPRODUCING MODE." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the Title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, and respectfully requests that the objection to the Title be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Okada et al. Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites and apparatus including, in part, "a point table for storing a plurality of the skipped section information associated with the respective contents." Similarly, amended independent claim 3 recites a method including, in part, "registering the accepted skipped section information in a point table while associating with the discriminated

contents.” Applicant respectfully submits that these features of amended independent claims 1 and 3 are neither taught nor suggested by Okada et al.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Okada et al. discloses, in FIGs. 16 and 17, an apparatus 70 and a corresponding method for reproducing contents recorded on a medium 75 exchangeably loaded therein in a predetermined order.

In contrast to the Applicant’s claimed invention, Okada et al. discloses a user-defined PGC (program chain) information table that stores a multiple of sequences of randomly picked cells to be used in video reproduction (FIG. 95). For example, as shown in FIG. 70C and disclosed at col. 77, line 29 to col. 78, line 16, a User-Define PGC Information provides specification information, such as cell identifier (CELL#1, CELL#2,...), AV file ID (AVF_ID), VOB ID (VOB_ID), cell start time (C_V_S_PTM), and cell end time (C_V_E_PTM).

Furthermore, Okada et al. teaches (col. 59, lines 10-27, col. 61, lines 39-52, col. 62 line 46 to col. 63, lines 3, and shown in FIGs. 44A-44F), a method of creating a user-defined PGCs and user-defined PGC table by linking only cells undergoing video reproduction. Okada et al. provides specific examples of the defined PGC information (col. 89, lines 42-56, col. 91, lines 25-49, col. 91, line 64 to col. 92, line 67, and shown in FIGs. 85-91, and 95). In addition, Okada et al. discloses that a multiple of sequences of cells stored in the user-defined PGC table are cells that do not get skipped while reproducing the source AV file. As shown in FIGs. 85-94 of Okada et al., the process for generating the User-Defined PGC Information specifically *excludes* storing information regarding skipped sections. For example, in FIGs. 90 and 91, the User-Defined PGC Information only includes storing information regarding the selected cells. Thus, Okada et al. is completely silent with respect to storing skipped section information.

Applicant respectfully submits according to the present invention, the information associated with the skipped sections within the loaded recording medium is purposely stored in a point table.

MPEP §2131 instructs that “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Okada et al. does not teach or suggest at least “a point table for storing a plurality of the skipped section information associated with the respective contents,” as recited by amended individual claim 1, and “registering the accepted skipped section information in a point table while associating with the discriminated contents,” as recited by independent claim 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Okada et al. be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant has added new claims 6 and 7. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 6 and 7 are allowable for their respective dependencies upon independent claims 1 and 3, and further for the features that each of claims 6 and 7 recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP



David B Hardy
Registration No. 47,362

Dated: June 22, 2004

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001